Payments in Transition

Technology, Incentives, and the Rise of Digital Infrastructure

Chung Hei Sing

Working Paper

December 2019

Payments in Transition

Technology, Incentives, and the Rise of Digital Infrastructure

Abstract

This paper examines the structural evolution of payments systems, focusing on the transition from fragmented, intermediary-driven models toward more integrated, data-enabled digital ecosystems. Historically shaped by regulatory constraints, domestic market structures, and incumbent-controlled networks, payments systems have exhibited persistent inefficiencies, opacity, limited interoperability, and misaligned incentives — not as market failures, but as features of systems designed to extract rather than create value.

A set of macro trends — advances in APIs and open banking, accelerating mobile adoption, generational behavioral shifts, and maturing regulatory frameworks — is compressing the timeline for structural change. New entrants and platform companies are redefining the competitive landscape by embedding payments within broader digital ecosystems, leveraging user data to expand into adjacent financial services, and systematically unbundling functions that incumbents have historically bundled for margin.

Incumbent institutions are responding through infrastructure modernization, strategic partnerships, and selective investment, but remain constrained by legacy architectures and revenue models that depend on the inefficiencies they are being asked to eliminate. The result is a competitive environment where the decisive battleground is shifting from transaction processing toward control of interfaces, data, and settlement infrastructure.

The paper argues that payments are evolving from a standalone financial service into foundational digital infrastructure — a layer upon which broader economic activity will increasingly depend. Early developments in distributed ledger technologies, digital assets, and programmable transaction frameworks point toward a further structural shift in how settlement, interoperability, and compliance are designed and governed. These developments remain nascent as of 2019, but their trajectory — shaped by the convergence of forces this paper describes — points toward a more fundamental redesign of payments infrastructure than the industry has yet fully absorbed.

The analysis has direct implications for financial institutions evaluating digital strategy, platform companies expanding into financial services, and policymakers and regulators designing frameworks for an ecosystem in transition.

Keywords: payments systems; digital payments; financial infrastructure; fintech; platform economics; interoperability; payment networks; data analytics; open banking; regulatory policy; digital assets

How to cite this paper: Sing, C. H. (2019). Payments in transition: Technology, incentives, and the rise of digital infrastructure. Working paper.

1. Introduction

The payments industry is undergoing a structural transformation — and the word "transformation" is not used loosely here. What is occurring is not incremental improvement within an existing model but the displacement of that model itself: from systems built around intermediary capture toward ecosystems built around consumer utility, data intelligence, and programmable infrastructure.

For most of its modern history, the payments industry has been a story of controlled change. Incumbents — banks, card networks, and their affiliated processors — established durable positions by solving real problems: enabling trust between strangers, absorbing fraud risk, and providing merchants access to credit-holding consumers. In doing so, they also built revenue models that rewarded transaction volume over system efficiency, and infrastructure that is far easier to defend than to modernize.

That equilibrium is now under pressure from multiple directions simultaneously. New entrants are targeting specific friction points within the payments value chain — peer-to-peer transfers, point-of-sale integrations, cross-border remittances — and using mobile-first design, lower cost structures, and network effects to scale rapidly. Large technology platforms are moving in from above, leveraging their existing user relationships and data assets to embed payments within broader digital experiences. And regulatory frameworks, particularly outside the United States, are actively dismantling the structural protections that kept incumbent moats intact.

The result is an industry in which the pace of change is accelerating faster than most incumbents' planning cycles. Markets such as China and India have already demonstrated that the transition from legacy infrastructure to integrated digital ecosystems can occur within a single decade when consumer adoption, technological capability, and policy intent align. The United States, despite significant innovation activity, has been slower — constrained by the depth of its existing card infrastructure and the institutional inertia that comes with incumbent profitability.

This paper provides a structured analysis of the payments landscape at an early but accelerating stage of consolidation—where the forces reshaping the industry are visible, and long-term competitive positions are not yet solidified. The analysis covers current industry conditions, the macro trends driving change, the strategies of new entrants and incumbent players, and the implications for institutions navigating this transition.

Bottom line: Payments are ceasing to function as a standalone financial service and are becoming foundational digital infrastructure. The organizations that recognize this shift earliest — and position themselves at the infrastructure layer rather than the service layer — will define the competitive landscape for the next decade.

2. The Payments Landscape

The global payments industry has always been shaped by local conditions: the currency regime, regulatory posture, consumer behavior, and merchant infrastructure of each market. That localism produced a global landscape that is deeply fragmented — not because fragmentation is efficient, but because the barriers to cross-border standardization have historically outweighed the incentives to overcome them.

Within each market, the industry's evolution has been slow by design. Regulatory oversight created stability; incumbent profitability removed urgency for change. Banks and card networks built durable positions not primarily through innovation but through the accumulation of trust relationships,

compliance infrastructure, and network scale that took decades and significant capital to establish. New entrants, however well-capitalized, cannot replicate that overnight.

What incumbents built, though, came with structural constraints that have become increasingly visible. The payments systems they control were optimized for a world of physical commerce, branch-based banking, and periodic settlement cycles. Mapped against the expectations of a digitally native consumer base, those systems exhibit four persistent and interconnected limitations.

Inefficiency. Traditional payment methods — cash, checks, card-based systems — introduce friction at multiple points across the transaction lifecycle. Multi-step authorization and settlement processes, batch processing cycles, and manual reconciliation overhead increase costs for both merchants and consumers without adding proportional value. In many cases, the complexity exists not because it is technically necessary but because it is institutionally convenient.

Opacity. Pricing structures across the payments value chain are layered and deliberately difficult to parse. Interchange fees, network assessment charges, processor markups, and foreign exchange spreads are embedded in ways that make true cost comparisons challenging. This opacity is not incidental — it is a structural feature of a system designed to sustain margin through complexity rather than through value delivery.

Misaligned incentives. Incumbent revenue models are predicated on transaction volume, creating a structural incentive to maximize the number of payment events rather than the efficiency of each one. Fees are charged at the point of the transaction, which means that the intermediary captures value whether or not the transaction is optimally routed or priced. In an environment where technology could eliminate many of these costs entirely, the incumbent interest lies in managing that elimination rather than enabling it.

Limited interoperability. Payments remain constrained by fragmented rails across institutions, geographies, and asset classes. Cross-border transactions require currency conversion through correspondent banking chains that can take days and consume 5–7% of transfer value in fees. Domestic transfers between institutions often depend on legacy batch systems that were designed for a world where overnight settlement was considered fast. The absence of a common interoperability standard is, again, not a technical failure — it is a product of incumbent systems that benefit from controlling the bridges between networks.

These structural limitations have created the conditions for disruption. Early platforms such as PayPal demonstrated two decades ago that internet-based infrastructure could reduce friction meaningfully while maintaining sufficient trust to achieve consumer adoption. The more recent proliferation of smartphones and application ecosystems has accelerated that transition — mobile wallets are emerging not just as a payment mechanism but as a primary financial identity layer for younger consumers.

As of 2019, the industry is expanding rapidly but remains highly fragmented. The global mobile wallet market was estimated at approximately $1.8 trillion in opportunity (CB Insights, 2019), a figure that reflects both the scale of the transition underway and the early stage at which it remains. Regional trajectories diverge sharply. China's super-app model — most visibly through Alipay and WeChat Pay — has demonstrated that payments can become the connective tissue of an entire digital economy within a single decade. India's government-led Unified Payments Interface (UPI) has shown how public infrastructure investment can accelerate financial inclusion at population scale. The United States, by contrast, has been slower to shift, reflecting the depth of existing card penetration and the higher

switching costs that come with a market in which 70% of consumer transactions were still conducted on card rails as of 2019.

At the same time, early-stage developments in APIs, distributed ledger technologies, and smart contract frameworks are beginning to suggest a more fundamental redesign — not just of the payment interface, but of the underlying architecture of settlement and interoperability. Several jurisdictions, notably Singapore through its central bank-led Project Ubin initiative, and Abu Dhabi through the ADGM's 2018 virtual asset regulatory framework, are already moving beyond conceptual exploration and into structured infrastructure design. These early signals — infrastructure experimentation by central banks, bespoke regulatory frameworks for virtual assets, government-led interoperability initiatives — deserve closer attention than they have received from mainstream financial commentary.

3. Macro Trends Reshaping Payments

The structural limitations described above did not persist simply because incumbents were complacent. They persisted because the conditions that would displace them — technological maturity, consumer behavioral shift, regulatory intent, and capital availability — had not yet converged. By 2019, that convergence was underway across six identifiable dimensions.

3.1 Technology and Infrastructure Innovation

The foundational enabler of change in payments is not any single technology but the layering of several that together lower the cost and complexity of building competitive payment infrastructure. APIs and open banking frameworks have made it possible for new entrants to build on top of existing financial rails without replicating the underlying compliance and operational infrastructure — a structural advantage that has compressed the capital requirements for market entry significantly.

Cloud infrastructure has made processing scale available on demand rather than as a fixed capital investment, shifting competitive advantage from those who own infrastructure to those who can best use it. And the emergence of distributed ledger technologies — while still early — introduced for the first time a credible technical basis for settlement without a central counterparty, with implications for cross-border payments, collateral management, and the architecture of financial system interoperability that the industry is only beginning to work through.

Consumer-facing technology trends reinforce this structural shift. As of 2019, consumer survey data indicated that approximately 64% of respondents planned to use a mobile wallet within the year, up from 46% at the time of survey — a 39% increase in stated intent reflecting a genuine behavioral transition, not a marginal preference shift (Accenture, 2019b). The proliferation of near-field communication (NFC) and biometric authentication was adding the security layer that had previously constrained contactless adoption, with industry projections pointing toward more than 18 billion biometric-enabled transactions annually by 2021.

3.2 Demographic and Behavioral Shifts

Generational change is not a soft trend in payments — it is a structural forcing function. Millennials and Generation Z are not simply younger versions of previous consumer cohorts with a preference for mobile. They are the first generations for whom digital financial interaction is the default, and for whom friction in a payment experience is not an inconvenience but a signal that the provider is not worth trusting.

Survey data from 2018–2019 reflects this clearly. Generation Z consumers exhibited higher propensity for instant peer-to-peer payment adoption than any other demographic group, with 69% using mobile banking applications on a daily or weekly basis compared to 17% of Baby Boomers (Accenture, 2019a). Critically, 73% of Millennials surveyed by Bank of America in 2018 reported they would be more receptive to a new financial product from a major technology company than from a traditional bank — a finding that should be read not as a brand preference survey but as a competitive warning to incumbents.

The implication is structural: as these cohorts become the primary earners and wealth accumulators, the products and institutions designed around older behavioral assumptions will face accelerating pressure to adapt or cede share.

3.3 Connectivity and Device Proliferation

The access layer for payments is expanding. Smartphone penetration in the United States was projected to grow from 257 million to 285 million users between 2018 and 2023 (Statista, 2019), and wearable device adoption was on a parallel trajectory. Each connected device is a potential payment terminal — and a potential data collection point.

The practical implication is that the distinction between "online" and "offline" commerce is disappearing. Payments are being embedded into contexts — rides, food delivery, healthcare interactions, workplace tools — where the payment is not a discrete event but a background function of a larger experience. The infrastructure required to enable that embedding is fundamentally different from the infrastructure built to process a card swipe.

3.4 Omnichannel Access and the Collapse of Channel Boundaries

Consumer payment behavior has become genuinely omnichannel — not in the sense that retailers use the term as a strategic aspiration, but in the observational sense that consumers move between physical and digital contexts within the same purchasing journey without noticing the transition. PwC's 2019 holiday consumer survey found that 91% of consumers planned to shop in-store, 84% online, and three-quarters intended to do both — often for the same category. Approximately 30% indicated they would use smart payment methods in physical retail: 24% by smartphone, 16% by wearable.

The payment infrastructure implications are significant. A system designed to serve a consumer in one channel at a time is already obsolete. What is required is unified orchestration across channels, with consistent identity, pricing, and experience — which is precisely the kind of capability that new platform entrants are better positioned to build than incumbents constrained by channel-specific legacy systems.

3.5 Data, Analytics, and the Monetization of Transaction Intelligence

Transaction data is the most underutilized strategic asset in financial services. Every payment event contains signal about consumer behavior, merchant performance, category preferences, and financial health — data that, in aggregate and at scale, is more valuable than the fee revenue generated by the transaction itself. Technology companies understood this a decade before financial institutions did.

Amazon's purchase data, Google's search-to-purchase attribution, and Facebook's social graph have each been leveraged to build targeted financial product recommendations and, increasingly, embedded payment and lending services. Financial institutions are beginning to invest seriously in analytics infrastructure to match this capability, but face structural disadvantages: data governance constraints,

siloed legacy systems, and organizational cultures that treat compliance as a limiting function on data usage rather than an enabling framework for responsible data utilization.

The competitive advantage in payments over the next decade will not be determined by who processes the most transactions. It will be determined by who extracts the most intelligence from those transactions and uses it to deepen the customer relationship.

3.6 Regulation: From Constraint to Infrastructure Design Input

Regulation has historically been framed as a constraint on payments innovation — a force that slows change, raises compliance costs, and protects incumbents behind licensing moats. That framing is becoming obsolete, and institutions that continue to operate under it will be caught off-guard.

The more accurate read of the regulatory direction of travel — made visible across multiple jurisdictions simultaneously — is that regulators are increasingly acting as infrastructure architects rather than gatekeepers. The most instructive example is the European Union's revised Payment Services Directive (PSD2), implemented in September 2019, which went well beyond two-factor authentication. It mandated open banking data access, requiring incumbent institutions to expose customer account data to third-party providers via standardized APIs — a deliberate structural intervention designed to dismantle the data monopoly that banks had accumulated through their account relationships and enable a new class of payment and financial service providers to compete on product quality rather than distribution control.

What is equally significant is that this regulatory direction was not confined to Europe. By September 2019, several jurisdictions had moved — through different mechanisms and at different speeds — toward treating digital payment infrastructure and virtual assets as subjects requiring proactive governance rather than passive observation.

Singapore's Monetary Authority (MAS) launched Project Ubin as early as November 2016, a multi-phase blockchain-based payment and settlement research program conducted with a consortium that included HSBC, JPMorgan, Credit Suisse, and the Singapore Exchange. By 2019, the project had completed proof-of-concept work on tokenized securities settlement, cross-border Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) interoperability with the Bank of Canada, and multi-currency payment networks — making Singapore among the first central banks globally to move from blockchain theory to structured infrastructure experimentation. The MAS simultaneously passed the Payment Services Act in 2019, introducing a licensing framework for digital payment token service providers — one of the first regulatory regimes of its kind in Asia. Taken together, these moves positioned Singapore not merely as a fintech-friendly jurisdiction but as a deliberate architect of next-generation payment infrastructure.

Abu Dhabi's Abu Dhabi Global Market (ADGM) took a parallel but distinct approach: in 2018, its Financial Services Regulatory Authority published what was, at the time, the world's first comprehensive and bespoke regulatory framework for spot virtual asset activities, covering exchanges, custodians, brokers, and asset managers. While most jurisdictions were still debating whether or how to classify digital assets, the ADGM had already built the regulatory scaffolding for an institutional-grade virtual asset ecosystem — a signal that at least one Gulf jurisdiction understood that attracting digital asset activity required regulatory clarity, not regulatory silence. On the mainland UAE, the Securities and Commodities Authority published a draft virtual asset regulation in October 2019, inviting public comment — an early formal acknowledgment at the federal level that the sector required a structured governance response.

In Hong Kong, the Securities and Futures Commission moved in November 2018 to publish regulatory standards for virtual asset fund managers and distributors, and separately invited virtual asset trading platforms to participate in a regulatory sandbox with a view to potential licensing. This was a pragmatic approach: extend existing regulatory jurisdiction as far as it could credibly reach, create a structured pathway for compliant platforms, and signal institutional engagement with the asset class without waiting for new primary legislation. By 2019, the SFC issued guidelines for security token offerings and virtual asset trading platforms and published a formal Position Paper establishing the opt-in framework for exchange licensing — laying what may prove to be the most substantive regulatory foundation for virtual asset activity in the Asia-Pacific region.

The pattern across these jurisdictions is consistent and instructive: the regulatory frameworks taking shape around digital payments and virtual assets were not designed to simply manage existing risks. They were designed to establish the terms on which the next generation of payment infrastructure would be built — who could participate, under what conditions, and subject to what compliance architecture. For financial institutions, this trajectory carries a strategic implication that goes beyond compliance readiness. AML and KYC requirements are migrating from back-office functions to front-end design constraints. Digital asset regulations are introducing new requirements around auditability, identity verification, and cross-border flow reporting that will define the architecture of the payment rails that follow current ones. Institutions that treat these requirements as cost items — to be minimized and managed — will find themselves outmaneuvered by those that engage early and treat regulatory clarity as a competitive asset.

The convergence of these six trends — technology infrastructure, demographic shift, device proliferation, omnichannel behavior, data intelligence, and regulatory redesign — is not creating a series of incremental improvements to the existing payments model. It is creating the conditions for its structural replacement.

4. Emerging Entrants and Platform Expansion

The structural inefficiencies described in Section 2 did not persist simply because they were unrecognized. They persisted because the incumbents who benefited from them controlled the infrastructure, the regulatory relationships, and the network effects that made displacement costly. What changed the calculus was the emergence of a new class of entrants — technology-native, mobile-first, and unconstrained by legacy architecture — who recognized that capturing a single point of friction in the payments value chain could be sufficient to establish a customer relationship that incumbents had taken decades to build.

The pattern is consistent across categories: enter through a specific pain point, establish trust through superior user experience, and expand into adjacent financial services. Each category below represents a distinct execution of that same strategic logic.

4.1 Digital Wallets and Consumer Payment Interfaces

The most visible category of new entrants targets the consumer interface directly. Platforms such as Venmo and Cash App have built substantial user bases by reducing peer-to-peer transfer friction to near zero — no fees, no branch visits, no three-day settlement wait. The experience is orders of magnitude simpler than initiating a bank wire, and that simplicity has proved sufficient to shift behavior at scale among younger consumers.

What makes these platforms strategically significant is not the peer-to-peer transfer function itself, which generates limited revenue, but what it enables. By establishing a habitual relationship with consumers around their most frequent financial interaction — paying a friend, splitting a bill — these platforms gain the customer touchpoint and transaction data from which adjacent financial products can be offered credibly. Both Venmo and Cash App had by 2019 begun integrating features such as stored value balances, direct deposit capability, and early access to cryptocurrency buying — each a step deeper into the financial relationship that incumbents had assumed was theirs by default.

4.2 Platform and Ecosystem Companies

The second category is more consequential in scale. Large technology platforms — Facebook, Amazon, Apple, Google, and Microsoft — are expanding into payments not because payments are a standalone revenue opportunity but because payments are the connective tissue that deepens their core ecosystems. For a platform whose competitive advantage is time-on-platform and behavioral data, every transaction that occurs outside its ecosystem is a signal lost and a relationship not strengthened.

Facebook's Libra initiative, announced in 2019, represented the most ambitious version of this logic: a permissioned blockchain-based digital currency designed to enable low-cost payments across WhatsApp, Messenger, and Instagram's combined user base of over two billion people. The strategic intent was transparent — to create a closed-loop payments layer within Facebook's ecosystem, capturing the transaction relationship that had previously required a bank account. Amazon Pay and Amazon Cash pursued parallel objectives: embedding payments into commerce flows where Amazon already controls the context, and extending financial access to underbanked populations whose purchasing behavior Amazon wanted to capture. CB Insights estimated the global digital payments market at $2.36 trillion as of 2019 — a scale that makes these moves rational even for platforms whose primary revenue comes from elsewhere.

4.3 Embedded Finance and Workflow Integration

A third category targets not the payment interface but the payment event itself — specifically, the friction created by the mismatch between how and when people earn money and how and when they need to spend it. Companies such as Earnin and Even enable on-demand wage access, allowing hourly workers to draw against earned but unpaid wages without waiting for the bi-weekly payroll cycle. This is not a marginal convenience feature; for a worker living paycheck to paycheck, access to $200 two days earlier can be the difference between a bank overdraft fee and financial stability.

Similarly, platforms such as Acorns and Spare Change embed micro-investment functionality into the payment flow itself — rounding up transactions and directing the difference into investment accounts. The payment becomes a financial planning tool rather than a discrete event. This category represents a structural observation that incumbents have largely missed: for many consumers, the pain point is not the payment mechanism but the timing and structure of financial flows that surround it. New entrants are redesigning those flows rather than simply improving the transaction experience.

4.4 Data-Driven Financial Gateways

Some entrants have taken a more indirect approach — acquiring users through non-payment services and subsequently monetizing through financial product referrals and payments integration. Credit Karma, with over 85 million users as of 2019, built its user base by offering free credit scoring and financial education — services that cost the user nothing but generate detailed financial profile data that

is highly valuable to lenders, card issuers, and insurers. Revenue is generated not through payments directly but through referral fees when users take up financial products surfaced by the platform.

The payments implication is structural: Credit Karma controls the moment at which a consumer decides to apply for a credit card or personal loan — which is the moment that determines which card network and which bank captures the subsequent payment volume. A platform that owns that decision moment controls downstream payment economics without ever processing a transaction.

4.5 Regional Super-Apps and Integrated Ecosystems

The most developed version of the payments-as-ecosystem-gateway model exists in Asia, where the super-app structure — a single application serving as the primary interface for commerce, financial services, transportation, and social interaction — has demonstrated that payments can become the connective tissue of an entire digital economy.

Ant Group's Alipay illustrates the model in its most advanced form. What began as an escrow solution for Taobao marketplace transactions had by 2019 expanded into a financial services ecosystem encompassing Yu'e Bao (a money market fund with over 500 million users at its peak), Ant Fortune (a wealth management platform connecting consumers with asset managers), and an insurance marketplace — all accessed through the same interface through which users make daily payments. The payment relationship is the entry point; the ecosystem is the business. Go-Jek in Indonesia and MercadoLibre in Latin America have pursued analogous strategies, each using the frequency and necessity of the payment interaction to establish habitual user engagement, which is necessary to support the distribution of higher-margin financial services.

These models carry a direct implication for how payments competition should be understood. The question is not which platform processes the most transactions. It is which platform uses the transaction relationship to construct the most complete and sticky financial ecosystem. Ant Group had answered that question by 2019; the rest of the industry was beginning to understand what had been built.

4.6 Fraud, Identity, and Security Infrastructure

The expansion of digital payments has created a parallel growth in fraud exposure. Industry projections estimated that online payment fraud in the United States would approach $7.2 billion by 2020 (Javelin Strategy & Research, 2019) — a figure that reflects not just the scale of digital commerce but the sophistication of fraud operations that have evolved alongside it. As payment flows move from physical to digital environments, the identity verification mechanisms that underpinned physical-world trust — a signature, a face, a physical card — require digital equivalents that are simultaneously secure and frictionless.

Biometric authentication represents the most significant response to this challenge. Alipay's 2018 Singles' Day data — 60% of transactions authenticated by facial recognition or fingerprint scan — demonstrated that biometric payment authentication was operationally viable at population scale, at least in a regulatory environment where biometric data collection is permitted. In the United States, the picture was more complicated: the Biometric Information Privacy Act in Illinois and analogous state-level legislation introduced meaningful constraints on the collection and use of biometric data, reflecting a genuine tension between fraud reduction objectives and individual privacy rights.

This regulatory divergence is itself a strategic consideration for institutions operating across jurisdictions. The identity infrastructure that enables frictionless biometric payment authentication in

one market may be legally constrained in another — and building a globally consistent payments experience requires navigating those constraints rather than assuming they will converge.

4.7 Strategic Pattern Across Entrants

Across these categories, a consistent strategic logic emerges. New entrants are not competing with incumbents on incumbents' terms. They are identifying specific points of structural friction — whether in the transaction interface, the payment timing, the identity layer, or the data relationship — and using technology to reduce that friction sufficiently to establish a consumer relationship from which broader financial services can be offered.

The result is an unbundling of the financial services stack that incumbents had assembled over decades: the account relationship, the payment function, the credit decision, the investment interface, and the identity verification layer are each being targeted independently. The entrants that succeed in capturing any one of these layers gain a platform from which adjacent layers become accessible — and each layer captured represents margin and relationship that incumbents can no longer assume is theirs.

5. Incumbent Responses: Adaptation Under Constraint

Incumbent financial institutions and card networks are not passive observers of the disruption described in Section 3. They are responding — through infrastructure investment, partnership structures, strategic acquisition, and capital deployment — with urgency that has increased measurably as the scale and speed of new entrant growth has become evident. The challenge incumbents face, however, is that the tools they are deploying to respond are in tension with the business models that make response necessary in the first place.

5.1 Infrastructure Modernization

The foundational response is infrastructure investment. Financial institutions are directing capital toward API integration, cloud migration, AI-enabled processing, and early-stage blockchain experimentation. These technologies individually improve processing efficiency and reduce operational overhead, and collectively represent an effort to bring legacy infrastructure closer to the architectural flexibility of technology-native competitors.

Bank of America's approach illustrates the depth of institutional engagement with distributed ledger technologies: as of 2019, the bank had filed approximately 50 blockchain-related patents, making it one of the most active financial institutions in the space. The bank's own framing is instructive — Catherine Bessant, the bank's Chief Technology Officer, described the effort as preparatory rather than immediately commercial: "While we've not found large-scale opportunities, we want to be ahead of it, we want to be prepared." That posture — investing in technological capability before the commercial case is fully visible — reflects a reasonable institutional response to a technology whose implications for settlement and interoperability are clear in direction but uncertain in timing.

5.2 Control of the Customer Interface

The second front of incumbent response is the consumer interface layer, where digital wallets and platform ecosystems are actively disintermediating the direct relationship between financial institutions and their customers. Visa and Mastercard have responded by developing Secure Remote Commerce (SRC) — effectively a standardized single-button checkout protocol for e-commerce that competes directly with the proprietary digital wallets deployed by Apple, Google, and Amazon at the point of

online purchase. The goal is to keep the card network in the transaction flow even as the consumer-facing interface migrates away from the bank-issued card and toward the platform wallet.

Banks have pursued parallel efforts through proprietary mobile applications and digital wallet integrations. JPMorgan Chase's acquisition of WePay — an online payments company — and the subsequent development of Chase Pay represents the buy-and-integrate approach: acquiring a fintech capability rather than building it, and embedding it within the bank's existing customer relationship infrastructure.

5.3 Partnership and Banking-as-a-Service

A third response model involves structural partnership with the fintech entrants that incumbents might otherwise compete against. The Banking-as-a-Service architecture — in which a regulated financial institution provides the licensed infrastructure and balance sheet while a fintech company provides the consumer-facing product and experience — has emerged as a practical mechanism for incumbents to participate in the new entrant ecosystem without abandoning their regulatory and infrastructure advantages.

Chime's partnership with The Bancorp Bank is the most widely cited example: Chime delivers the mobile-first consumer experience and brand relationship; Bancorp provides the FDIC-insured deposit infrastructure and the regulatory compliance framework. The arrangement is commercially rational for both parties — the fintech gains regulated infrastructure it cannot replicate cheaply; the incumbent bank gains deposit volume and access to a consumer demographic it has struggled to acquire directly. The structural tension in this model is that it implicitly validates the fintech's competitive advantage in user experience while reducing the incumbent to infrastructure provider — a role that carries lower margin and reduced strategic relevance over time.

5.4 Capital Allocation and Strategic Investment

The fourth response is capital deployment through corporate venture investment. Goldman Sachs and Citigroup were the most active US bank investors in fintech as of 2019, with Goldman having committed to 58 fintech investments since 2012 — 7 in payments — and Citi to 40 over the same period, with a similar payments concentration. In aggregate, US banks had invested in 19 payments and settlement companies since 2012, with notable positions including Square and Transactis.

These investments serve two distinct strategic purposes that are worth distinguishing. The first is financial: exposure to the return profile of high-growth fintech companies, managed through corporate venture structures that operate alongside the bank's balance sheet. The second is strategic: through investment relationships, incumbents gain visibility into emerging business models, access to partnership conversations, and in some cases the ability to influence the strategic direction of companies whose technology they may eventually need. Visa and Mastercard's joint investment in Plaid — an API infrastructure platform that enables consumer access to bank account data — exemplifies the latter: both networks recognized that the data portability infrastructure Plaid was building would define how payment account connectivity worked in the next generation of financial services, and chose to own a position in that infrastructure rather than wait for it to be used against them.

5.5 The Build-Buy-Partner-Invest Framework

Across these response modes, a consistent strategic toolkit emerges: build internal capabilities, acquire external ones, partner where building or buying is impractical, and invest where the strategic landscape

is uncertain enough that ownership stake is more valuable than direct control. These are not strategies in themselves but mechanisms — and the choice between them in any given context reflects an institution's assessment of how quickly a capability needs to be in-house, how central it is to competitive positioning, and how much of the underlying risk the institution is willing to absorb.

The important observation is that incumbents are using all four mechanisms simultaneously, which reflects both the breadth of the disruption they face and the heterogeneity of the threats. A single entrant targeting the checkout interface is a different competitive problem than a platform company building a closed-loop currency. The response to the former might be a product build; the response to the latter requires regulatory engagement and political strategy that no corporate venture investment can provide.

5.6 Structural Constraints and the Limits of Adaptation

The most significant challenge incumbents face is not any individual competitive threat but the structural tension embedded in their own business models. Legacy payment revenue is predicated on transaction volume, layered intermediation, and the opacity of pricing that those structures enable. The technology-driven reforms that would make incumbents more competitive on user experience — real-time settlement, transparent pricing, open API access — are precisely the reforms that compress the margins which current revenue models depend upon.

This creates an adaptation problem that capital and partnership cannot fully resolve. An incumbent that successfully modernizes its infrastructure and improves its user experience may find that it has made itself more competitive while simultaneously reducing the per-transaction economics that justified the modernization investment. For incumbents, modernization often cannibalizes existing revenue streams. The fintech entrants that incumbents are partnering with and investing in do not face this tension — they were built for an environment in which the margin is in the ecosystem, not the transaction.

The result is that incumbent adaptation, however well-resourced, tends to be incremental rather than structural — focused on incremental improvements to existing models rather than adapting to the structural changes reshaping the market. The institutions best positioned to navigate this are those that recognize the distinction between defending existing margin and building competitive relevance in the ecosystem that follows.

6. Implications for Financial Institutions, Platforms, and Policymakers

The structural forces described in the preceding sections — technology-enabled disintermediation, demographic shift, platform expansion, and regulatory redesign — are not unfolding independently. They are converging simultaneously, and their combined effect is not a set of incremental changes to the existing payments model but a reordering of the competitive logic that has governed the industry for decades. This section draws out the strategic implications of that reordering for three constituencies: financial institutions, platform and technology companies, and policymakers and regulators.

6.1 Payments as the Entry Point to Ecosystem Control

The most significant structural shift in payments is the decoupling of payment volume from payment value. Historically, the institution that processed the transaction captured the value — in the form of interchange fees, float, and data. That equation is breaking down. The most competitively important position in the emerging payments landscape is not where the transaction is processed but where the customer relationship originates and where the data that transaction generates is held.

The super-app models operating in Asia, the platform wallets being built by FAMGA, and the data-driven financial gateways pioneered by companies like Credit Karma all reflect the same underlying logic: payments are the most frequent and habitual form of financial interaction a consumer has, and the institution that controls that interaction controls the relationship from which all adjacent financial services — credit, insurance, wealth management, investment — can be offered. Competitive advantage in payments is therefore increasingly measured not in transaction margin but in ecosystem breadth: the number of high-value financial interactions that a payment relationship can anchor.

For financial institutions, this implies a strategic reorientation that goes beyond digital product investment. A bank that modernizes its mobile app while leaving its underlying account relationship unchanged has improved a feature, not its competitive position. The institutions best positioned to capture value in the next decade will be those that use payments as a deliberate gateway — building the data infrastructure, partnership models, and product adjacencies that convert a transactional relationship into a financial ecosystem.

6.2 The Battle for Infrastructure, Interface, and Data

Competition in payments is increasingly occurring on three distinct but interconnected layers, and an institution's position on each layer will determine its long-term strategic relevance.

The interface layer is where the consumer interaction occurs — the mobile wallet, the checkout button, the embedded payment within a platform. Control of the interface means control of the customer experience, the branding relationship, and the first-party data generated at the point of transaction. This is where new entrants have made the most visible progress, and where incumbents face the most immediate competitive pressure.

The infrastructure layer is where transactions are settled, compliance is enforced, and the rules of the system are defined. Control of infrastructure provides a structurally more durable competitive position — incumbents retain significant advantages here through regulatory licensing, capital requirements, and network scale. However, early developments in distributed ledger technologies and programmable settlement frameworks are beginning to suggest that infrastructure control itself may be contested in ways that have not been possible in previous generations of payment system design.

The data layer cuts across both. Whoever controls the data generated by payment transactions — the behavioral patterns, the merchant relationships, the cross-category spending signals — controls the most valuable strategic asset in the ecosystem. As Hal Varian (2019) observes in his analysis of AI and industrial organization, data's economic value lies not in its scarcity but in its predictive utility: the firm with more data about user behavior can make better decisions, offer more personalized products, and reduce credit and fraud risk more effectively than competitors with less. This dynamic already favors technology platforms over financial institutions in most consumer contexts, and the gap is unlikely to narrow without deliberate institutional investment in data infrastructure and governance.

6.3 Incentive Realignment and the Structural Compression of Margins

The payments industry's existing margin structure depends on three conditions that are each under pressure: the opacity of pricing, the necessity of intermediation, and the absence of low-cost alternatives. Technology is systematically eroding all three.

APIs and open banking frameworks are making pricing more transparent and intermediary steps more optional. Mobile-first entrants are demonstrating that many payment functions incumbents charge for can be delivered at or near zero cost. And the proliferation of digital wallets, P2P platforms, and

embedded finance solutions is giving consumers viable alternatives to bank-originated payment methods across a growing portion of their financial activity.

The McKinsey Global Payments Report (2019) projects that global payments revenue will grow from approximately $1.9 trillion to over $2 trillion by 2025 — but that growth will be unevenly distributed. The institutions best positioned to capture it are those that have moved beyond transaction fees toward ecosystem-based revenue models: data monetization, financial product cross-selling, and platform services. For institutions that remain dependent on interchange fees and processing margins, the trajectory is toward compression — not because payments will shrink, but because the price of payment processing is moving toward its economic floor as technology reduces the cost of delivery.

6.4 The Embedding of Payments into Broader Economic Workflows

One of the more consequential structural shifts underway is the progressive disappearance of payments as a visible consumer action. The embedded finance models described in Section 4 — wage access platforms, round-up investment tools, integrated checkout solutions — are reducing the payment event to a background function within a larger economic activity. The consumer does not experience a "payment"; they experience a ride, a meal, a financial planning interaction that happens to involve a transfer of value.

This invisibility of the payment is not a marginal convenience improvement. It fundamentally changes the competitive dynamics of the industry. When a payment is visible, consumers can compare alternatives, evaluate costs, and switch providers. When a payment is embedded, the competitive choice has already been made — by the platform, the employer, or the application that controls the workflow. For institutions, this implies a strategic imperative to be present at the workflow layer, not just the transaction layer. The institution that is not embedded in the contexts where economic activity occurs will increasingly find that the transaction arrives only after the competitive choice has been resolved elsewhere.

6.5 Regulatory Engagement as Strategic Positioning

For policymakers and regulators, the implication of the analysis in this paper is that the window for proactive infrastructure design is open but not indefinitely so. The experience of markets where platform consolidation has already occurred — China being the most illustrative example — suggests that the regulatory frameworks established in the early period of a payments technology transition tend to persist and define the rules of the ecosystem that follows. Regulators who engage early — as PSD2 did in Europe, as MAS did in Singapore through Project Ubin and the Payment Services Act, as the ADGM did in Abu Dhabi through its 2018 virtual asset framework — establish the governance architecture for next-generation payment infrastructure. Regulators who engage reactively find themselves attempting to impose rules on systems that already reflect the priorities and assumptions of the entities that developed them.

The specific regulatory questions that warrant proactive engagement in 2019 and the near term include data portability and access (who can build on payment data, and under what conditions), identity infrastructure (how digital identity is verified and who controls it at the point of payment), cross-border interoperability (how payment rails across jurisdictions are connected and governed), and digital asset classification (how programmable settlement technologies are categorized, supervised, and eventually integrated into formal payment infrastructure). These are not compliance questions. They are infrastructure design questions, and the answers will shape the competitive landscape of financial services for the next decade.

For financial institutions, the practical implication is parallel: regulatory engagement is no longer a compliance function that sits downstream of strategy. In an environment where the rules of the payment system are actively being rewritten — through PSD2, through digital asset frameworks, through open banking mandates — the institutions that participate in shaping those rules will operate in a more favorable environment than those that simply comply with whatever emerges. The institutions best positioned to navigate this transition will treat regulatory relationships as strategic assets rather than cost centers.

6.6 Where to Position: A Framework for Ecosystem Decision-Making

Across institutions, platforms, and regulators, the common strategic question is where to position within the evolving payments ecosystem — and that question cannot be answered without first accepting that the ecosystem is changing shape. The boundaries between financial institution, technology platform, and infrastructure provider are becoming less defined, not more. A bank can become a platform. A platform can become a bank. A settlement network can become a programmable infrastructure layer.

Given this fluidity, the more useful framing is not "what type of institution are we?" but "which layer do we control, and what does that layer allow us to access?" Control of the interface provides customer relationships and data. Control of infrastructure provides rule-setting authority and network position. Control of the data layer provides predictive advantage and monetization optionality. Most institutions cannot compete on all three simultaneously — but the institutions that have no position on any of these layers will find themselves progressively reduced to commodity processing, competing on cost in a market where cost is declining.

The strategic choice is therefore one of deliberate positioning: deciding which layer to own, which layers to participate in through partnership, and which to cede to others — and making that choice actively, rather than having it made by default as the ecosystem consolidates around competitors who decided earlier.

7. Conclusion

The payments industry in 2019 stands at the beginning of a structural transition that is more fundamental than the digital convenience improvements of the past two decades. What is changing is not the interface through which payments are made but the underlying logic of how value is created, captured, and distributed in a system that has been controlled by the same set of incumbents, under largely the same set of rules, for the better part of a century.

The structural limitations of that system — its inefficiency, its opacity, its misaligned incentives, its fragmentation across geographies and institutions — were not accidents of poor design. They were features of a system engineered to sustain the competitive advantages of the institutions that built it. Those features are now under pressure from a convergence of forces that incumbents neither designed nor control. These include a generation of consumers for whom digital financial interaction is the default; technology-native competitors with the capital, data, and infrastructure flexibility to target specific inefficiencies; and regulatory developments that are gradually reducing the barriers that have historically protected incumbent positions.

The incumbents are not passive. They are investing, acquiring, partnering, and deploying capital at a scale that reflects genuine strategic urgency. But the structural tension at the core of their position — that the changes necessary to remain competitive are the same changes that compress the margins on

which their current business models depend — is not resolvable through investment alone. It requires a willingness to accept cannibalization of existing revenue in exchange for competitive relevance in the ecosystem that follows.

The most important structural observation in this paper is not about any specific technology or any specific entrant. It is that payments are ceasing to be a standalone financial service and are becoming foundational digital infrastructure — the layer which commerce, financial planning, identity verification, and access to financial products will increasingly depend upon. The organizations that recognize this shift and position themselves at the infrastructure layer — whether as payment rail operators, data infrastructure providers, or ecosystem orchestrators — will define the competitive landscape of financial services for the decade ahead.

Early developments in distributed ledger technologies, digital assets, and programmable transaction frameworks are beginning to suggest the outline of what that infrastructure layer might eventually look like: more automated, more interoperable across institutions and geographies, and designed with compliance embedded at the architecture level rather than applied as an external constraint. These developments are nascent as of 2019. Their trajectory, however, is consistent with the broader direction of travel this paper has described — toward a payments system that is less intermediary-dependent, more transparent, and more programmable than the one that exists today.

The organizations best positioned in that future will not necessarily be those with the largest balance sheets or the most established networks. They will be those that understood earliest that the competitive battleground had shifted — from products to infrastructure, from transactions to ecosystems, from regulatory compliance to regulatory architecture — and positioned themselves accordingly.

References

Accenture. (2019a). Global payments pulse survey 2019. *Accenture.*

Accenture. (2019b). 2019 global financial services consumer study. *Accenture.*

Bank of America. (2018). Better money habits millennial report.

BIS. (2018). Sound practices: Implications of fintech developments for banks and bank supervisors. *Bank for International Settlements.*

BIS. (2019). Committee on payments and market infrastructures: Digital innovation in payments. *Bank for International Settlements.*

CB Insights. (2019). Fintech trends report 2019.

Deloitte. (2019). Digital payments trends: The future of payments.

European Central Bank. (2019). Crypto-assets: Implications for financial stability, monetary policy, and payments and market infrastructures.

European Commission. (2015). Directive (EU) 2015/2366 on payment services (PSD2).

European Payments Council. (2019). Payment threats and fraud trends report.

Ethereum Foundation. (2014). A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform.

Federal Reserve. (2019). The 2019 federal reserve payments study.

Javelin Strategy & Research. (2019). Identity fraud study: Fraudsters seek new targets and victims respond. *Javelin Strategy & Research.*

McKinsey & Company. (2019). Global payments report 2019: Amid sustained growth, accelerating challenges demand bold actions.

Nakamoto, S. (2008). Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system.

PwC. (2019). Retail banking 2020: Evolution or revolution?

Rochet, J.-C., Tirole, J. (2002). Cooperation among competitors: Some economics of payment card associations. *The RAND Journal of Economics, 33*(4), 549–570.

Statista. (2019). Smartphone and wearable device adoption statistics.

Varian, H. (2018). Artificial intelligence, economics, and industrial organization. *National Bureau of Economic Research.*

Agrawal A., Gans, J., Goldfarb, A. (2019). The economics of artificial intelligence: An agenda (pp. 399–422). *University of Chicago Press.*

World Bank. (2018). Payment systems worldwide: A snapshot.